

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 5, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 are amended to correct typographical errors; and claims 21-23 are hereby added. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0152658 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter “Ozawa ‘658”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,062 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter “Ozawa ‘062”) and further in view of Japanese Patent Pub. No. 2000-111910 to Yanagi (hereinafter “Yanagi”) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants traversed the rejection because none of the cited prior art, including Yanagi, suggests the desirability of the claimed invention. *The prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention.* See MPEP 2143.01.

In particular, the Office Action states in the last paragraph of page 4 that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the sequential backlight of Yanagi with the trans-reflective display taught by Ozawa ‘658 and Ozawa ‘062 **in order to provide a display in which superior hue can be established.** Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misunderstood the teachings of Yanagi. Yanagi discloses in paragraphs 0003-0005 and drawing 7 that a prior art device including a backlight having three mono-color CRTs, such as R, G and B and an optical diffusion plate 53 formed on the front face has a problem that a hue is inferior. Yanagi discloses in paragraphs 0007-0012 and drawing 1 providing a light filter sheet on the front face of the optical diffusion plate in order to obtain a superior hue. Therefore, in contrast to the statement in the Office Action, Yanagi merely teaches the desirability of adding a light filter sheet. Therefore, none of the cited prior art, including Yanagi, suggests the desirability of the claimed invention.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes Reg. No. 53,805
for
Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant